

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States latest and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1850 Alexandrid, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,553	07/29/2003	Eng-Giap Koh	59644 (71987)	7474
7590 10/17/2005		EXAMINER		
Mr. Peter F. Corless EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP 101 Federal Street Boston, MA 02110			DOAN, DUC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	
			DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/630,553	KOH ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Duc T. Doan	2188		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access that any objection to the objected to the content of the content	r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa			

Art Unit: 2188

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-8 are in the application.

Claims 1-8 are rejected.

Specifications

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

Art Unit: 2188

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makishima (
Japan JP 11-164234-A) and in view of Miura (US 5583715);

(Evidentiary references: Allen et al (US 5151990)).

As for claim 1, Makishima describes a data storage method, which is applicable to a computer device having a RTC (real-time clock) unit (It's well known in the art that a computer device is provided with a real time clock; For example, the clock is used to generate the creation date of files directories stored in a computer; Makishima's page 13 paragraph 12, page 21 paragraph 33 describes function of such a clock), comprising the steps of: (1) determining if a memory unit of the computer device has enough capacity for data storage when the computer device receives data and an inputted request for storing the data; if no, prompting an error message to a user and terminating a data storage process; if yes, proceeding to step (2) (Makishima's page 22 paragraph 36 describes a mean to detect the signal which is generated when a memory card is inserted); (2) reading the RTC unit via the computer device to obtain a time value of a particular date when the data are received; (3) determining if the memory unit of the computer device performs data storage operation on the particular date; if no, setting an identification value to be 1, and proceeding to step (5) (Makishima's page 23 paragraph 38 clearly describes the situation if only one directory has been made on the same day, the directory name comprises of date, time and the sequence number of 1); if yes, obtaining an identification value of the latest processed data folder on the particular date, and proceeding to step (4); (4)

Art Unit: 2188

adding the obtained identification value by 1 via the computer device (Makishima clearly describes in page 23 paragraph 38 the situation if more than one directory has been made on the same day, the name for the new directory is obtained from the last directory and the increment of a sequence number); and (5) using the time value from the RTC unit and the identification value from the step (3) as a name for a folder to be created (Makishima's page 23 paragraph 38, page 14 paragraph 16 clearly describes of using the date as obtained from RTC to form the name for the directory being created), and completely storing the data in the memory unit via the computer device (Makishima describes a directory naming method which uses date and time and sequence number such that the files in these directories can keep the same names and yet the files will not be overwritten, Makishima's page 10 lines 1-15, pages 25-26 paragraph 45; This directory name method can be applied to images stored in any recording medium such as memory card, magnetic, magneto-optical of various devices such as cameras (Wantanabe's page 12 paragraph 10; pages 20-21 paragraphs 33-34); By organizing files into directories the files can easily moved to other devices such as personal computer (Makishima's page 19 paragraph 30). Makishima does not describe the claim's detail of checking the capacity of the receiving storage device. However, Miura describes of a computer receiving images to store into its floppy disc (Mimura's Fig 1). The computer checks for the capacity of the disc to determine if the disc can store the images, if not the operation is aborted, and an error processing is generated (Mimura's Fig 1: #s3, #s9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the capacity checking method as suggested by Miura in Makishima's system to detect and abort the operation early, thereby the system does not have to carry out the disc access and disk writing steps, since the disc accessing and writing are much slower than IC

memory device (Makishima's column 1 lines 55-62). As for the claim's aspect of sending an error message to the user, it has been know in the art that when an operation cannot be carried out, the user is sent a error message; This teaching is evident in Allen et al (US 5151990 column 1 lines 35-40; column 2 lines 25-35), which is introduced here as an evidentiary reference.

Page 5

As for claim 2, Makishima describes wherein the computer device is selected from the group consisting of a desktop personal computer (PC), notebook computer, digital camera, digital voice/video recorder, mobile phone, multimedia player, and personal digital assistant (PDA) (Wantanabe's page 12 paragraph 10; pages 20-21 paragraphs 33-34; page 19 paragraph 30).

As for claims 3-4, Makishima wherein the memory unit is a hard disk (HDD) or memory card (claim 3); wherein the data received by the computer device are from a HDD or memory card (claim 4) (Wantanabe's page 12 paragraph 10; pages 20-21 paragraphs 33-34; page 19 paragraph 30).

As for claim 5, the claim recites wherein in the step (5), the time value from the RTC unit and the identification value from the step (3) are used as a name for a created folder, allowing the data to be stored in this folder. The claim rejected base on the same rationale as in the rejection of claim 1.

As for claims 6-7, Makishima describes wherein the memory card is selected from the group consisting of a CF (CompactFlash) card, PCMCIA (Personal Computer Memory Card International Association) card, SD (secure digital) card, MS (memory stick) card, and SMC (smart media card) (claim 6; Makishima's page 12 paragraph 10); wherein the memory card is

selected from the group consisting of a CF card, PCMCIA card, SD card, MS card, and SMC (claim 7; Makishima's page 12 paragraph 10).

As for claim 8, the claim recites describes wherein in the step (5), the time value from the RTC unit and the identification value from the step (3) are used as a name for a data file to be stored in the computer device. The claim rejected base on the same rationale as in the rejection of claim 1.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ueda et al (US Pub 2004/0117411).

Hamilton et al (US Pub 2003/0043420).

Shimada et al (US Pub 2004/0128298).

Shimada et al (US Pub 2004/0105656).

When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Doan whose telephone number is 571-272-4171. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM 05:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/630,553

Art Unit: 2188

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin L. Ellis Primary Examiner Page 7

12. 2.2M.